APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,638	08/25/2003	Joshy Joseph	POU920030044US1	3890

7590   06/06/2008

Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002

EXAMINER
PATEL, CHIRAG R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/648,638	JOSEPH, JOSHY
		Examiner	Art Unit
		CHIRAG R. PATEL	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 February 2008</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-22 and 24-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-22 and 24-30</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

February 25, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-22, and 24-30 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner notes that

claims 8 and 23 are cancelled by the applicants.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 9-22, and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Lucas et al. – hereinafter Lucas (US 6,754,884).

As per claims 1 and 16, Lucas discloses a method for implementing complex mapping of Open Grid Services Architecture (OSGA) service data, the method comprising:

defining a set of standard mapping rules for service data descriptions in a service oriented architecture; wherein said set of standard mapping rules are implemented through an OSGA Service Data Mapping Language (OSDML) configured to implement mapping of the OSGA service data to a native resource representation thereof, through extensible language features; and   (Col 2 lines 39-51)

defining a flexible framework engine for processing rules and mappings defined by said OSMDL. (Col 2 lines 39-51)

As per claims 2 and 17, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML is an extensible markup language (XML). (Col 2 lines 39-51)

As per claims 3 and 18, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines an extensible set of at least one of: data source mechanisms and resource access mechanisms. (Col 2 line 66 - Col 3 line 13)

As per claims 4 and 19, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines parameterization capabilities for supporting dynamic values. (Col 4 lines 30-53)

As per claims 5 and 20, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines executable scripts to process data transformation and queries. (Col 2 lines 52-65)

As per claims 6 and 21, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines a mechanism for defining private mapping for an internal state of a service. (Col 2 line 66 – Col 3 line 13)

As per claims 7 and 22, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines a set of rules for defining and mapping service data change notification subscriptions from a corresponding native resource implementation thereof. (Col 7 lines 34-40)

As per claims 9 and 24, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said framework engine includes a uniform interface to services implementation. (Col 2 lines 39-51)

As per claims 10 and 25, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said framework engine includes a pluggable provider interface, said pluggable provider interface being configured to support language extensions and new service data providers. (Col 2 lines 39-51, Col 3 line 57 – Col 4 line 7)

As per claims 11 and 26, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1 O, wherein said framework engine is configured to support at least one of: parameterization, flexible data source binding and pluggable script execution. (Col 2 lines 39-51)

As per claims 12 and 27, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1 O, wherein said framework engine further comprises a document repository. (Col 2 line 66 – Col 3 line 13)

As per claims 13 and 28, Lucas discloses the method ofclaiml0, wherein said framework engine further comprises a generic interface for supporting OSDML instance data retrieval. (Col 2 line 66 – Col 3 line 13)

As per claims 14 and 29, Lucas discloses the method of claim 10, wherein said pluggable provider interface comprises at least one of: a common information object

manager (CIMOM) and a database adapter. (Col 2 lines 39-51, Col 3 line 57 – Col 4 line

7; one of ... database adapter)

As per claims 15 and 30, Lucas discloses the method of claim 10, wherein said

framework engine is configured to map service data definitions to relational database

schema. (Col 2 line 66 – Col 3 line 13)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chirag R Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-

7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to

4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll free).

        /C. R. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2141

                                                    /Jason D Cardone/
                                    Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145